

# **ECONOMIC IMPACT/ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

*Answer to best of the proponent's ability, as required by ADPCEC Regulation 8, Chapter 3.5*

## **STEP 1: DETERMINATION OF ANALYSIS REQUIREMENT (to be included in petition to initiate rulemaking)**

### **APC&EC REGULATION NO. 19**

**Regulations of the Arkansas Plan of Implementation for Air Pollution Control  
May 2008**

**1A.** Is the proposal expressly addressed by a Federal requirement?

Yes. See 1B.

**1B.** If 1A is YES, is proposed regulation equivalent, or more stringent, or less stringent than federal requirement?

- If equivalent – Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required
- If more stringent - Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is required
- If less stringent - Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required, but does require federal agency approval prior to adoption if the proposal is part of an authorized state program.

This change is equivalent to federal requirements, thus an Economic Benefit Analysis is not required. The proposed amendment of Regulation Number 19 will amend Chapter 14 of the regulation. The proposed change in Chapter 14 is required to fulfill the State's obligation as part of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR). CAIR controls the interstate transport of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> emitted by fossil-fuel fired Electric Generating Units (EGUs) through the use of a cap and trade program. October 19, 2007, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) modified portions of CAIR that were incorporated by reference into Chapter 14 of Regulation 19. The Department proposes this rulemaking primarily to make the provisions of Regulation Number 19 to conform to this change.

## **STEP 2: THE ANALYSIS (to be included in petition to initiate rulemaking, if required)**

### **2A. ECONOMIC IMPACT**

Not Required.

### **2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT**

Not Required.